

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

RONALD WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 06-12588

-vs-

PAUL D. BORMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

FREDA RANDALL-OWENS, et al.,

STEVEN D. PEPE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Defendants.

_____ /

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

On September 17, 2007, this Court accepted the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation granting Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, denying Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, denying Plaintiff's Motion to Correct Order, denying Plaintiff's Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order, and denying Plaintiff's Motion to file a Supplemental Affidavit. Now before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration of that Order.

A motion for reconsideration will be granted if the moving party demonstrates that the court's order contains "a palpable defect by which the court and parties have been misled," and that "correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case." L.R. 7.1(g)(3). A "palpable defect" is a defect which is obvious, clear, unmistakable, manifest or plain. *Marketing Displays, Inc. v. Traffix Devices, Inc.*, 971 F. Supp. 262, 278 (E.D. Mich. 1997) (internal citation omitted). In the present case, Plaintiff has failed to meet this standard.

In the motion before the Court, Plaintiff renews his argument that the Magistrate Judge and this Court erred in not considering his Response to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. However, the Magistrate Judge did consider his Response. Further, this Court considered Plaintiff's

previous Objections and found no error.

Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 121).

SO ORDERED.

s/Paul D. Borman
PAUL D. BORMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: October 5, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served on the attorneys of record by electronic means or U.S. Mail on October 5, 2007.

s/Denise Goodine
Case Manager